UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,008	08/21/2006	Satoshi Kadokawa	Q96579	6887
65565 SUGHRUE-265	7590 08/15/201 5 550		EXAMINER	
	LVANIA AVE. NW		YABUT, DANIEL D	
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3656	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/15/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

SUGHRUE265550@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Occurs	10/590,008	KADOKAWA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	DANIEL YABUT	3656			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 A</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (RTO-893)	4\ \ Interview Summer	(PTO-413)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sada (US Patent 5,885,690).

Sada discloses rolling sliding parts of a surface which contacts another member comprising a(n):

Re claims 1-3

• Outermost surface position is defined as a highest portion out of fine roughnesses existing on the surface (col. 3 ll. 33-35; Fig. 1A)

Regarding claim 1, although Sada discloses the roughness profile R having a maximum height Ry being from 1 to 3 micrometers (col. 3 ll. 32-34) and that "the ratio of the open area of the very small recesses to the whole area of the rolling contact surface 11a, that is, the area ratio is set to 5 to 20% and more particularly, 5 to 10%" (col. 3 ll. 38-41), Sada does not expressly disclose an occupation ratio being set from 90% or more to less than 100%, the occupation ratio being calculated by dividing a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 2.0 micrometers from the outermost surface position by an area of an overall surface of a portion that contacts the other member.

Art Unit: 3656

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an occupation ratio being set from 90% or more to less than 100%, the occupation ratio being calculated by dividing a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 2.0 micrometers from the outermost surface position by an area of an overall surface of a portion that contacts the other member, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See MPEP 2144.05.

Regarding claim 2, although Sada discloses the roughness profile R having a maximum height Ry being from 1 to 3 micrometers (col. 3 ll. 32-34) and that "the ratio of the open area of the very small recesses to the whole area of the rolling contact surface 11a, that is, the area ratio is set to 5 to 20% and more particularly, 5 to 10%" (col. 3 ll. 38-41), Sada does not expressly disclose an occupation ratio being set from 80% or more to less than 100%, the occupation ratio being calculated by dividing a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 1.5 micrometers from the outermost surface position by an area of an overall surface of a portion that contacts the other member.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an occupation ratio being set from 80% or more to less than 100%, the occupation ratio being calculated by dividing a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 1.5 micrometers from the outermost surface

Art Unit: 3656

position by an area of an overall surface of a portion that contacts the other member, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See MPEP 2144.05.

Regarding claim 3, although Sada discloses the roughness profile R having a maximum height Ry being from 1 to 3 micrometers (col. 3 ll. 32-34) and that "the ratio of the open area of the very small recesses to the whole area of the rolling contact surface 11a, that is, the area ratio is set to 5 to 20% and more particularly, 5 to 10%" (col. 3 ll. 38-41), Sada does not expressly disclose an occupation ratio being set from 50% or more to less than 100%, the occupation ratio being calculated by dividing a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 1.0 micrometers from the outermost surface position by an area of an overall surface of a portion that contacts the other member.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an occupation ratio being set from 50% or more to less than 100%, the occupation ratio being calculated by dividing a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 1.0 micrometers from the outermost surface position by an area of an overall surface of a portion that contacts the other member, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or

workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See MPEP 2144.05.

Page 5

Sada as modified above further discloses the following:

Re claim 4

Occupation ratio of a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 1.5 micrometers from the outermost surface position, to the area of the surface that contacts the other member is set to 80 % or more (see above regarding optimization of ranges; MPEP 2144.05)

Re claim 5

Occupation ratio of a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 1.0 micrometers from the outermost surface position, to the area of the surface that contacts the other member is set to 50 % or more (see above regarding optimization of ranges; MPEP 2144.05)

Re claim 6

- Occupation ratio of a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 1.5 micrometers from the outermost surface position, to the area of the surface that contacts the other member is set to 80 % or more (see above regarding optimization of ranges; MPEP 2144.05),
- Occupation ratio of a sectional area of a virtual plane in a plane direction at a portion that is positioned at a depth of 1.0 micrometers from the outermost surface position, to the area of the surface of a portion that contacts the other member is set to 50% or more (see above regarding optimization of ranges; MPEP 2144.05)

Application/Control Number: 10/590,008 Page 6

Art Unit: 3656

Re claims 7-12

• The rolling sliding part is a roller constituting a cam follower unit (Fig. 3) in which an outer peripheral surface of a roller (11a) supported rotatably around a roller supporting shaft (12) is brought into contact with an outer peripheral surface of a cam (at 7) via a rolling contact.

Re claim 13-18

• The rolling sliding part is a rocker arm (at 3; col. 5 ll. 52-59) into a part of which a cam follower unit is incorporated.

Re claims 19-24

• The rolling sliding part is an inner ring (near 13; col. 5 ll. 43-51) having a cylindrical inner ring raceway on an outer peripheral surface or a shaft (12).

Re claim 25-30

• The rolling sliding part is a needle (13; col. 5 ll. 43-51) that is provided rollably between a cylindrical inner ring raceway and a cylindrical outer ring raceway (Fig. 2)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see the Pre-Brief Conference request, filed 4/28/2011, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sada (US Patent 5,885,690) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sada (US Patent 5,885,690).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to DANIEL YABUT whose telephone number is (571)270-5526.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richard W. Ridley can be reached on (571)272-6917. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DANIEL YABUT/

Examiner, Art Unit 3656

8/4/2011

/Justin Krause/

Application/Control Number: 10/590,008

Page 8

Art Unit: 3656

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3656